DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 197 EC 132 886

TITLE	A Survey for California of Model Programs Serving Handicapped Infants and Preschool Children [and] Summary Information Describing Model California Programs Serving Handicapped Infants and Preschool Children.
INSTITUTION	Human Resources Research Organization, Alexandria, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	HumRRO-FR-HTRD(CA)-10; HumRRO-FR-HTRD(CA)-80-11
PUB DATE	Jul 80
GRANT	27-B160-80-3293-7100
NOTE	48p.; For a related document, see EC 132 887.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Demonstration Programs; *Disabilities; Infants; *Preschool Education; *Program Descriptions; *Surveys; Validated Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

A study to gather information describing model infant and preschool programs for handicapped children in California is reported. Information was received from 142 programs (102 in California) including validated First Chance projects, Outreach projects funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Master Plan agencies in California, innovative and preschool incentive grant programs in California, exemplary Head Start programs, and other model programs in the public and private sectors. A compendium of program descriptions was developed to help state and local educators in selecting the most appropriate early intervention model for adoption/adaptation, consistent with federal and state law, specific to local needs, and available resources. The survey included questions on the following: general information (such as the average number of years in operation), instruction and assessment, service delivery, use of staff, program placement, parental participation, dissemination, training and technical assistance. Among many findings were that the programs are heavily concentrated in urban and suburban areas, that the most popular instructional model in use is developmental, that wide use is made of community resources, and that two thirds of the programs report providing mainstreaming to some degree. Data from the survey are reported in an accompanying summary document which charts program characteristics against answers from public and private agencies or schools. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED202197

FR-MTRD(CA) 80-10

A SURVEY FOR CALIFORNIA OF MODEL PROGRAMS SERVING HANDICAPPED INFANTS AND PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

John E. Taylor
Project Director

Prepared Under Grant No. 27-B160-80-3293-7100 from the California State Department of Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Lavisky
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

July 1980

Western Division
Human Resources Research Organization
300 N. Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

EC 132886

FOREWORD

Statement of Funding:

The study reported here was part of a program of studies in Special Education in the Western Division of the Human Resources Research Organization.

The study was conducted during the period July 1, 1979 to June 30, 1980, under the auspices of the Special Studies supported by Grant No. 27-B160-80-3293-7100, between the California State Department of Education and the Human Resources Research Organization.

Disclaimer:

The full report is reproduced here in this form for distribution as a technical report under the grant. Results of this study are the sole responsibility of the investigators. Official endorsement of the California State Department of Education or the Human Resources Research Organization is not implied.

Acknowledgements:

A special note of thanks is due two individuals: Ms. Marsha Shearer, who conceived the project and managed it through its first few months, and Mrs. Mary Ellen Lathrop, who assisted in handling the details of data collection, analysis, and report preparation. In addition, we wish to acknowledge the assistance of the members of the California Early Childhood Consortium, California Regional Resource Center and State Department of Education who reviewed and helped to pilot our draft survey instruments. Finally, we wish to thank those many individuals who participated in our project and provided us with detailed information about their programs for the handicapped infant and preschool child.

Project Director

July 30, 1980

Date

ABSTRACT

During the past decade there has been a significant increase in the number of programs serving handicapped infants and preschool children. Information concerning these programs is needed by state and local educators in the selection of models consistent with local needs and state requirements. Information on existing models has been difficult to access and has not been readily available. As the California Master Plan for Special Education is phased in throughout the state, it is important that educators have this information so that they can select the most appropriate models or model components for local implementation.

The purpose of this study was to gather information identifying and describing model infant and preschool programs for the handicapped. The information obtained was assembled for use by education decision makers to assist them in selecting model programs or program components for adoption/adaptation by local education agencies, i.e., programs that comply with regulations and have the potential to meet the needs of local education agencies.

Two products resulted from this project:

- Selected Programs Serving Handicapped Infants and Preschool Children: A Compendium of Program Descriptions for California Educators

  This document is a compendium of individual program descriptions presenting the salient characteristics of model programs in and outside California, in both the public and private sectors.

- Summary Information Describing Model California Programs Serving Handicapped Infants and Preschool Children

This document is a matrix of summary quantitative information on model programs in California operating in the public and private sectors.

Relevant program information was gathered through the use of a mailed survey questionnaire. Project staff developed the format and data items in collaboration with the California Department of Education, Office of Special Education (OSE), the California First Chance Consortium, and the California Regional Resource Center.

The targeted programs included all JDRP-validated First Chance projects funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH); all BEH funded Outreach projects; all Master Plan agencies in California; all innovative and preschool incentive grant programs in California; exemplary Head Start programs serving the handicapped in California and throughout the country; and other model programs in the public and private sectors. Only partial success was achieved in surveying Head Start programs.

Information was received from 142 programs (102 from in-state and 40 from out-of-state). The data were collated and analyzed to prepare the program descriptions and summary matrix. Descriptions were written for all 142 programs and assembled to form the compendium. All quantifiable information describing program characteristics of the 102 in-state programs was assembled to form the summary matrix.

Distribution of the matrix to state and local educators will provide them with a summary of the salient characteristics of the public and private

programs that are now operating within the state. Distribution of the compendium of program descriptions will provide them with the detailed program-specific information they need to select the most appropriate early-intervention model for adoption/adaptation, consistent with federal and state law, specific to local needs, and available resources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Background and Related Research	1
Statement of the Problem	4
STUDY METHODS	6
Selection of Programs to be surveyed	6
Development of Survey Instruments	7
Distribution of Survey Package	8
Response to Survey	9
Treatment of Data	10
FINDINGS	15
Program Availability	15
Packaging of Program Information	15
Salient Features of In-State Programs	16
SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS	19
Summary of Major Findings	19
Conclusions	19
Recommendations	20
BIBLIOGRAPHY	22
APPENDIX	23

FIGURES

Figure 1	12

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND AND RELATED RESEARCH

During the decade of the 1970's, there was a significant increase in the number of programs which provide service to infant and preschool handicapped children and their families. Several factors contributed to this increase. They are briefly discussed below.

The passage of PL 9-538 in 1968 established the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program. Funds were provided to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) for development of model programs designed to meet local needs. The number of model programs funded under this act grew from 24 in 1968 to 185 in FY 1979. These projects have developed new curricula (Bluma, Shearer, et al, 1976), methods of instruction (Wood, 1975), assessment instruments (Sanford, 1974), delivery systems (Shearer and Shearer, 1972), procedures for family involvement (Grim, 1974), and data management systems (Fredericks, et al, 1977). These projects have disseminated their results widely. Through outreach activities, training and technical assistance have been provided to assist in model replication at other sites.

The mandate to include handicapped children in Head Start programs has resulted in a service delivery system that stresses integration, peer modeling, and individualized instruction. The Office of Child Development recognized the need to assist Head Start personnel in this integration effort. They have funded regional Resource Access Projects (RAPs) to assist Head Start programs in accessing needed training and technical assistance. Follow

Through programs in the primary grades are helping regular public school teachers to develop the skills necessary to meet the special needs of these children.

The passage of PL 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, institutionalized the standards laid down by the courts, state legislatures, and other policy bodies over the prior eight years. It mandated that beginning in September of 1978, all handicapped children, ages three to 18, shall receive a free appropriate public education together with the requirements for due process, placement in the least restrictive environment, individualized educational planning, and non-discriminating testing. However, services to preschoolers are mandated only if the federal requirement does not conflict with any state law, practice, or court order.

Modifications in state laws and regulations which mandate early intervention have increased the number of state-funded projects for early identification and intervention. The California Master Plan for Special Education, adopted in 1974, has served as a model for other states by providing improved educational opportunities, support, and instructional components for young handicapped children. Further modification of the Master Plan (AB 1250, 1977) eliminated the pilot aspect of the program and provided for the phase-in of the Master Plan on a statewide basis. Specifically, "early educational opportunities are available to all children between the ages of three years and four years and nine months who require intensive service and special programs" [Sec. 56301 (b)]. Special Education Service Regions (SESRs) may serve children younger than three [Sec. 56301 (c)]. Presently, the Master Plan is being implemented in numerous SESRs throughout the state. The California State Department of Education, OSE, also funded approximately 50 preschool incentive

grants, 14 infant-preschool discretionary programs, and approximately 25 innovative programs to serve young handicapped children, as well as numerous permissive programs and development centers for the handicapped (DCH). Additionally, the BEH funded 11 Early Childhood programs in California, representing various stages of development, demonstration, and outreach. The Office of Human Resources (formerly the Office of Child Development) funds a RAP located in Los Angeles to provide technical assistance to Head Start programs throughout the state and Region IX. These programs, together with other BEH-funded early childhood outreach projects, provide the body of programs available for adoption/adaptation within California.

With so many new model programs appearing, the question of program validity becomes an important issue. A major difficulty in evaluating the validity of model programs is the lack of research-based data. Three present-day solutions are found most frequently in the literature.

- o Third party validation of project results (USOE, 1977).
- o Replication of projects' results at different and varied locations (DeWeerd, 1977).
- o Face validity (Fristoe, 1975).

Infant and Early Childhood demonstration projects funded by the BEH, incentive grants, infant-preschool discretionary funds, and innovative, permissive, and DCH programs funded by the California Office of Special Education are responsible primarily for the provision of direct service, as are the SESRs. Summative and formative evaluation data frequently exist; however, the process is internal to the project. Control group data and third party evaluations of projects are rare. To ameliorate this situation somewhat, the BEH has encouraged

demonstration programs to submit their results to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) of the U.S. Office of Education. If data on child change, project replicability, and cost-effectiveness are provided, the project is approved for national dissemination and replication.

Project replicability is demonstrated by the 60 Outreach projects funded by the BEH. Their primary responsibility is to provide ongoing training and technical assistance to other programs resulting in project replication.

Projects that have achieved face validity as a result of multi-year funding, citations in the literature, having developed widely used materials, and recommendations by outside sources, may also be considered as models.

In addition to project characteristics, state and local educators within California need to select models along two other dimensions. The models must meet state legal requirements and they must be responsive to local needs.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Two major problems affect an educator's ability to select a model that complies with state law and meets local district needs.

1. A wide variety of program models to serve the handicapped infant and preschool population is in existence. However, descriptive information about these models is not easy to access.

2. Once general information on projects is available, it is then important to be able to define salient characteristics of these programs. Which models comply with California's laws and regulations? What is the evidence of child change, cost-effectiveness, and replicability? What is the staff/student

ratio? What assessment instruments are used? To what extent are parents involved in the program? These few examples pose relevant questions; but again, the answers are difficult for an educator to access.

Resolution of these two problems will help California educators to select a model project, from among the many, which most closely matches local needs and satisfies state requirements. As the California Master Plan for Special Education is phased in, mandating services at three years for children requiring intensive special education services, it is important that educators have access to the information necessary for selecting the most appropriate model or model components for implementation in ther LEA/SESR. This study provides California educators with the information required for making such informed decisions. The information is designed to assist them in identification and selection of the appropriare model programs to adopt or adapt to fit their particular needs.

STUDY METHODS

SELECTION OF PROGRAMS TO BE SURVEYED

In order to give the project wide overall coverage, specific sites providing services to infant and preschool handicapped were identified under the following categories of large projects and programs: BEH First Chance Projects - Outreach and JDRP-Validated; California State Programs - Master Plan, Preschool Incentive Grant, and Innovative Programs; Head Start Programs - All Regions [nominations to be provided by the Resource Access Project (RAP) Directors]: and Private Programs in California.

Existing infant and preschool programs for the handicapped, from which information was sought included the following:

- The eight model BEH projects approved by the U.S. Office of Education (USOE, 1977) for national dissemination and replication.
- All BEH Outreach projects that have demonstrated replicability in at least three different and varied locations.
- All infant and preschool programs operating with funding from the California Master Plan for Special Education.
- Programs in California which provide service to handicapped three to five-year-old children through preschool incentive grants from the state.
- California infant programs that have been established through innovative grants from the state.
- Head Start programs within California and around the country which provide exemplary services to young handicapped children.

Information on additional programs within the public and private sectors was sought from nominations provided by the California State Department of

Education, the California Regional Resource Center, and the First Chance Consortium. These agencies had agreed to serve in an advisory capacity to the staff on the project.

The number and diversity of programs selected for survey in the study increased the likelihood that the full age range, types and extent of handicapping conditions, varieties of service delivery systems, and important program characteristics would be represented. Project funding limitations did not permit undertaking the exhaustive survey that would have included infant-preschool discretionary programs, all the numerous permissive programs and DCH programs.

DEVELOPMENT OF SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

1. Criteria for Inclusion

A set of criteria for including a program in the survey was drawn up to ensure that all respondents to the survey would be providing information about programs that are, in fact, relevant to the study objectives. These criteria reflected both state and federal requirements (AB 1250 and PL 94-142) and the general requirements for a program's adoption/adaptation by a local district.

2. Survey Questionnaire

Groups of items were drafted to gather information about the following general program characteristics: Demographics, Child Population Served, Program Philosophy, Instruction and Assessment, Service Delivery, Employment of Staff, Program Placement, Parental Participation, Program Evaluation and Dissemination, Training and Technical Assistance. Pools of individual items

under each general program characteristic were written so as to elicit the most relevant specific information for educators considering the adoption/adaptation of a program. Approximately half of the items requested narrative information ranging from a sentence to a short paragraph; the rest of the items required only a checkmark or a one-word fill-in. The most appropriate items were then selected and assembled to comprise a draft questionnaire of approximately six pages in length.

3. Piloting and Revision

Draft versions of both the criteria for inclusion and the full questionnaire were submitted to selected members of the California First Chance Consortium. They were asked to complete the questionnaire, as a program respondent would, and to then critique both the questionnaire items and the criteria. Other members of the consortium, and staff of the State Department of Education, and the California Regional Resource Center were asked to critically review the questionnaire and the criteria. The piloted questionnaires, critical reviews, and suggestions for revision from these three groups provided project staff with valuable feedback on both instruments. This feedback was used to prepare the questionnaire and the criteria in final form for mail out.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY PACKAGE

All survey recipients were notified of their selection by a letter from the project director, which explained the project in detail. Enclosed with the letter were the survey questionnaire, the criteria for inclusion, and a set of instructions on how to employ the criteria to determine their eligibility to participate. All state public school districts which were surveyed

also received a letter signed by Dr. Wilson Riles, California State Superintendent of Public Instruction, requesting their cooperation in the project. All survey materials were sent directly to each site in one mailing. A sample set of the survey package is included as Appendix A.

RESPONSE TO SURVEY

1. General

There was a generally enthusiastic response by recipients of the survey package. This is inferred from the high number of phone calls received, the rate of return, and the frequent volunteering of information beyond that called for in the questionnaire. The comments received by phone tended to fall under the following categories: expressions of appreciation for being included in the survey; endorsements of the project's objectives to gather and disseminate much-needed information; compliments on the comprehensiveness of the questionnaire; requests for clarification on individual items; explanation as to why a particular program did not meet the criteria for inclusion; requests for additional time in order to do a thorough job in completing the questionnaire; and requests for feedback on project results.

2. Head Start Directors

RAP directors from each region had been sent a letter explaining the project's objectives and procedures, its state sponsorship, and the use to be made of its findings. They were asked to assist by nominating the three or four best Head Start programs providing exemplary services to the young handicapped in their region. These nominated sites were to subsequently receive the survey package.

Reactions were mixed. Some responded quickly with nominations; many did not respond at all. Follow-up phone calls disclosed that many of the RAP directors were reluctant to make nominations in that they did not want to make judgmental evaluations about the programs in their region.* They felt they were in no position to single out certain programs as being exemplary. In some instances, the phone discussions resulted in nominations; in others they did not. Overall, nominations were received from approximately half of the regions. Though all programs that were nominated were sent survey packages, because of the limited number of nominations received, Head Start programs were under-represented in the survey.

3. Questionnaire Returns

The survey package (letter of explanation, instructions, criteria for inclusion, and questionnaire) was sent to a total of 291 programs. Completed questionnaire forms were returned by 142 program representatives who determined that their program did meet the criteria for inclusion; 21 uncompleted questionnaires were returned by program representatives who determined that their program did not meet the criteria. No responses were received from the remaining 129, most of which were private programs and thus less likely to meet the criteria for inclusion. The criteria largely reflected state and federal regulations for public education, which do not necessarily apply to private programs.

*The RAPs are funded to provide technical assistance to Head Start programs in serving handicapped children; they are not funded to provide specific program evaluation.

TREATMENT OF DATA

1. Development of Summary Matrix

The first step in developing the matrix was to determine the format of the matrix, i.e., the categories for organizing its rows and columns for entry of data. Determination of the row categories for displaying program characteristics was accomplished by inspection of a sample of the completed questionnaires. All questionnaires that could be expressed quantitatively were selected for inclusion. Some 32 specific items were aggregated under the following eight general categories of program characteristics: General Information, Child Population Served, Instruction and Assessment, Service Delivery, Employment of Staff, Program Placement, Parent Participation, and Dissemination, Training and Technical Assistance. These made up the major row designations for the matrix.

Inspection of completed questionnaires also led project staff to try out several ways of categorizing matrix columns for presenting program types. Attempts to categorize by (a) large project and program, (b) source of funding, (c) mode of service delivery, and (d) handicapping condition, all proved to be unsatisfactory in that each set of categories allowed for too much overlap across categories. That is, individual programs would often fit under two or more categories. A suggestion was provided by Nancy N. Obley, Coordinator State Implementation Grant for Early Childhood Education, California Dept. of Education (OSE), who had reviewed a draft prototype matrix. She suggested that categorizing by type of agency would be most useful to educational decision-makers and should eliminate the problem of overlap.

Accordingly, a four-fold set of categories by type of agency was tried and adopted for the matrix columns: Public Agencies (e.g., regional centers, County Offices of Education, Head Start); Public School Districts; Private Agencies (e.g., Agency for Infant Development, Agency for Retarded Citizens); and Private Schools. These categories, being mutually exclusive, eliminated the problem of individual programs fitting more than one category. Figure 1 following depicts the format adopted for the Summary Matrix.

Program Characteristics	Type of Program: Public Agencies	Public Schools	Private Agencies	Private Schools	All Combined
GENERAL INFORMATION					
CHILD POPULATION SERVED					
INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT					
SERVICE DELIVERY					
EMPLOYMENT OF STAFF					
PROGRAM PLACEMENT					
PARENT PARTICIPATION					
DISSEMINATION, TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE					

Figure 1.

As quantifiable data from the 102 completed questionnaires for California programs were posted and reduced for entry into the matrix. Depending upon the nature of each item, the data were expressed in terms of frequencies or averages.

The finished summary matrix was prepared as a separate companion product to this report, entitled "Summary Information Describing Model California Programs Serving Handicapped Infants and Preschool Children."

2. Program Descriptions

The premise followed in developing the format for the program descriptions was that each description should be both comprehensive and concise so that an educator seeking program models could access the important information about each program quickly. A format that would permit the construction of one-to two-page program descriptions was sought. Accordingly, a general outline for the program descriptions was developed by telescoping into four, the eight categories of program characteristics employed for the matrix. The outline used provided for: General Program Information (description, philosophy, children served, demographics); Conduct of Program (service delivery, placement, instruction and assessment, parent involvement); Program Effectiveness (evidence for) and Dissemination and Technical Assistance (techniques and materials). This general outline was followed in preparation of a program description from each completed questionnaire.

The resulting descriptions varied somewhat in both length and level of detail, reflecting the variability found in the completed questionnaires.

Whereas many programs had information to provide for all questionnaire items, some did not. In some instances respondents found sections of the questionnaire to be not applicable to their program. The provision of information on program costs was particularly variable and fragmentary. Many either had no cost figures or chose not to report them; others provided very rough estimates, which ranged from the extremes of $33 to $14,000 per child per year. Given the unreliability of these figures, it was decided to not report cost information in either the program descriptions or the summary matrix. One hundred thirty-eight program descriptions were written, using all of the completed questionnaires for both in-state and out-of-state programs.* These were assembled into a compendium prepared as a second companion product to this report entitled "Selected Programs Serving Handicapped Infants and Preschool Children: A Compendium of Program Descriptions for California Educators."

*Inspection of completed questionnaires by project staff resulted in the elimination of four out-of-state programs because they do not provide direct services.

FINDINGS

PROGRAM AVAILABILITY

The 102 in-state programs along with the 40 out-of-state programs that participated in the survey, constitute a rich resource for California educators who are seeking models for local implementation. These programs are such a resource for three reasons: (1) they are reported to be consistent with the provisions of PL 94-142 and AB 1250; (2) they offer diverse combinations of program characteristics that could be adopted/adapted to fit the quite differing needs and resources of education agencies; and (3) they provide models across a variety of public agencies, public school districts, private agencies and private schools.

Representatives of these programs appear to be enthusiastic to share information, serve as models, and generally assist in the dissemination of their program techniques and materials.

PACKAGING OF PROGRAM INFORMATION

The information provided by respondents, while variable in level of detail and completeness, proved to be amenable to reduction and summarization in the two products of the project. The summary matrix for in-state programs provides quantitative information on who is being served, by whom, and by what means. It provides a meaningful way of encapsulating California's current programs that serve the preschool handicapped. The program descriptions provide specific and detailed descriptive information (both quantitative and qualitative) about specific programs in-state and out-of-state that can

be used as models. Both products provide information of value for educators at both the state and local levels.

SALIENT FEATURES OF IN-STATE PROGRAMS

The preschool handicapped population in California is currently being served by a large number of programs in both the public and private sectors. Information was received on 37 in-state programs conducted by public agencies, 34 by public school districts, 19 by private agencies, and 12 by private schools. General statements of findings, drawn from the detailed data entered in the summary matrix for in-state programs are provided here.

General Information

- The ratio of public to private programs responding to the survey was approximately two:one.
- The average number of years in operation reported across all programs was seven. A few exceptions were over 20 years old.
- Programs are heavily concentrated in urban and suburban locales. Among the public agencies, county education offices provide most of the 34 programs serving rural areas, and the six programs serving rural/remote areas.
- The average number of children now being served by a program was reported to be 34.

Instruction and Assessment

- The most popular instructional model in use is developmental. Eighty-five programs reported following this model.

- Nearly all programs indicated that they cover all developmental areas listed on the questionnaire; eleven reported being involved with sensory-motor development.
- The use of published curricula is mixed; 51 reported using them and 45 reported not.
- Approximately three times as many programs report using special equipment as report not doing so.
- Most programs report employing one-on-one instruction to some degree; only four programs reported using none at all.
- The majority of programs reported conducting formal assessments once to several times per year.
- The most frequently maintained child records are: anecdotal (76 programs); checklists (63 programs); and charts/graphs (52 programs).

Service Delivery

- Seventy-five of the programs reported providing center/classroom programs, 30 reported providing center/classroom combined with home-based programs, and 15 reported providing home-based programs.
- Wide use is made of community resources: medical (52 programs); diagnostic (50 programs); social service agencies (49 programs); and CCS/Regional Centers (35 programs).
- Practically all are involved with child transportation; only four programs reported not transporting children.

Use of Staff

- The average number of teachers per program varies: public school programs reported the lowest (two); and private schools reported the highest (seven).

- Teaching staff professionals include: master teachers/program coordinators (70 programs); teachers certified in special education (64 programs); and teachers certified in early childhood education (35 programs).
- Non-teaching staff professionals include: speech and language clinicians (74 programs); psychologists (73 programs); occupational/physical therapists (55 programs).
- Seventy-five programs reported using paraprofessionals.

Program Placement

- Approximately two-thirds of the programs report providing mainstreaming to some degree.
- The self-contained classroom is the most frequently reported placement option (66 programs); 23 programs provide combination home and self-contained classroom placement.

Parental Participation

- Most programs reported that a high percentage of parents is involved in program activities. The average percentage of parents active was 62. They most frequently participate as volunteers, planners, advisors, classroom aides, and transporters.

Dissemination, Training and Technical Assistance

- Almost all programs provide some form of help to others interested in implementation. Visitation/observation is offered by 85 programs; phone/mail consultation by 65 programs; and workshops at the program site by 51 programs.
- Only 16 reported that their programs impose special criteria/requirements on adopting agencies.
- Program replication has been limited. Of the 29 programs reporting replication elsewhere, 14 were replicated in urban areas, 10 in suburban areas, seven in rural areas, and one in a rural/remote area.

SUMMARY/CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

This survey of programs serving the preschool handicapped in and outside California disclosed that there exists a large number and variety of such programs now in operation. These constitute a ready source of model programs for use by California educators as they seek to implement such programs. They are consistent with the requirements of PL 94-142 and AB 1250, and they demonstrate how various combinations of program characteristics have been implemented across a wide variety of schools and agencies in both the public and private sectors. It was also found that representatives of these operating programs are willing to make available their expertise, techniques and materials to others who are planning to establish or improve such programs.

The data gathered were found to be amenable to collation and organization for general use. Two products were developed for use by educators seeking such information: (1) a compendium of program descriptions for all programs surveyed, and (2) a survey matrix of quantitative data for the in-state programs surveyed. In both documents the information is categorized by: public agencies, public school districts, private agencies and private schools.

CONCLUSIONS

This project has produced two documents which the California Department of Education, Office of Special Education, and local education agencies can

use as a reference source in the selection or development of infant and preschool models for local implementation. Prior to the conduct of this project, educators did not have ready access to the information needed for informed decisions. The major benefit to be derived from this increased knowledge base should be an improvement in both the quality and the timeliness of service delivery to handicapped infants and preschool children in California. Specific advantages are seen to be:

- Less time elapsing between new program start up and full implementation.
- A more appropriate match between local and state requirements and program characteristics.
- More realistic prediction of personnel requirements for carrying out program objectives.
- Improved information about outside resources that are needed in meeting program objectives.
- Improved knowledge of the administrative requirements necessary for effective program implementation.
- The opportunity to combine components from various programs in order to meet local needs more closely.
- Improved opportunities to contact operating programs for information, site visitation and technical assistance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The availability of these two new sources of information should be made known to educators at the state level who are involved with the education of handicapped infants and preschool children.

The administrators of local education agencies should be likewise apprised of the availability of this increased knowledge base to them.

Because the field is rapidly expanding and more and more programs are being fielded, this knowledge base is subject to obsolescence. Provision should be made for keeping this new knowledge base current. A biennial updating of this information, through survey or similar means should suffice.

Any updating should include infant-preschool discretionary, permissive and DCH programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Assembly Bill #1250, State of California, 1977.

Amendments to Third Draft of California's Annual Program Plan for Fiscal Year 1978, Under Part B, Education of the Handicapped Act, Sacramento: California Department of Education, 1977.

Bluma, S., Shearer, M., Frohman, A., and Hilliard, J. *Portage Guide to Early Education*, Portage, WI: Cooperative Educational Service Agency #12, 1976.

California Master Plan for Special Education, Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1974.

DeWeerd, J. *Early Childhood Education for Exceptional Children, A Handbook of Ideas and Exemplary Practices*, Jorden, J., et al (eds) Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977, pp 3, 6.

Education of Handicapped Children: Implementation of Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act, Rules and Regulations. *Federal Register*, Vol. 42, August 23, 1977.

Fredericks, H. D., Baldwin, V. L., Grove, D., and Moore, W. *Early Childhood Education for Exceptional Children, A Handbook of Ideas and Exemplary Practices*, Jorden, J., et al (eds) Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1977, pp 98-108.

Fristoe, M. *Language Intervention Programs for the Retarded: A Catalog of Original Structured Language Programs in Use in the US*, Montgomery, AL: State Department of Education, 1975.

Grim, J. (ed) *Training Parents to Teach: Four Models*, Chapel Hill NC: Technical Assistance Development Systems, 1974.

Guidelines for Preschool Handicapped - DRAFT. The California Consortium, 1978.

Joint Dissemination Review Panel, *Ideabook*, US Office of Education and the National Institute of Education, 1977.

Management Information System Handbook, Sacramento County Office of Education, 1977.

Sanford, A. *Learning Accomplishment Profile*, Chapel Hill NC: Training Outreach Project, 1974.

Shearer, M. and Shearer, D. "The Portage Project: A Model for Early Childhood Education," *Exceptional Children*, 1972, Vol. 39, pp 210-217.

"Task Force on Funding and Quality Standards for Infant Development Programs," Sonoma County: Agency for Infant Development, 1977.

United States Office of Education, *Educational Programs That Work*, HEW, 1977.

Wood, M. *Developmental Therapy: A Textbook for Teachers as Therapists for Emotionally Disturbed Young Children*, Athens, GA: Rutland Center, 1975.

APPENDIX A

Sample Set of the
Survey Package

Dear Colleague:

The Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) has received a grant from the California Office of Special Education to conduct a national survey of model programs serving handicapped infants and preschool children. Programs to be included in the survey must meet both state and federal requirements (see enclosed Criteria for Inclusion, items 6 - 10).

The purpose of the survey is to provide information to California educators about existing exemplary programs. As districts begin to gear up to meet the 1982 mandate, the survey data can be used by them to access information on assessment, curriculum development, parent involvement, record keeping, etc. which appear to be consistent with local needs. Districts will have a source - programs already in existence that have gone through the developmental period - that can provide needed training and technical assistance. By completing this survey, you can help prevent 'reinvention of the wheel', decrease start-up time, and increase the number of young handicapped children receiving appropriate quality services.

Several districts have more than one early intervention program; if this applies to you, please duplicate and complete the survey so that each program can be represented.

The survey is enclosed, along with a set of criteria and a set of instructions. Please complete the survey and return it to us by November 30, in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to call. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

John E. Taylor

John E. Taylor
Project Director

JET:mel
Enclosures: 4

xc: Dr. Lalit Roy
Dr. Gordon Duck
Mr. Don Keeney

"A National Survey for California of Model Programs Serving Handicapped Infant and Preschool Children"

Criteria for Inclusion

1. Program or project has been operational for at least one school year.
2. Program or project serves handicapped children within the 0-5 age range.
3. Group data on child change available using pre/post criterion and/or norm referenced assessment measures.
4. On-site visitation at your agency is available to others.
5. Staff are available to provide training and technical assistance to others either in person, by phone and/or mail.
6. Individualized Educational Programs (IEPs) reflecting assessment results are on file for each handicapped child served. Child's instructional program is directly related to IEP goals and objectives.
7. Assessment procedures meet AB 1250 and PL 94-142 requirements:
   - Selected procedures and materials are not racially, culturally, or sexually biased.
   - No single assessment instrument is the sole criterion for determining placement.
   - Procedures and materials are in the child's mode of communication.
8. Child's placement in program is in accordance with the least restrictive environment (LRE) provision.
9. Parents have the opportunity to participate in meetings to develop, review and revise their child's IEP.
10. Procedural safeguards as stipulated in AB 1250 and PL 94-142, are in place:
    - Written notification to parents prior to assessment.
    - Provision of interpreter/translator if family's native language is not English.
    - Written notification to parents when initiating change in educational placement.
    - Opportunity for parents to present concerns regarding identification, assessment or placement.
    - Parental access to all relevant records.
    - Opportunity for parents or school personnel to request an impartial due process hearing.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR
COMPLETING SURVEY

1. First, compare the characteristics of your program with the 10 criteria spelled out in the Criteria for Inclusion. If in your judgment your program essentially meets these criteria, please proceed to complete the survey, observing Items 2 - 6 below.

   However, if you find that your program does not meet these criteria, please fill in your name and date, complete Demographic Items #1 and #2, and return the survey to us.

2. Please type or print the requested information clearly.

3. If more than one answer applies to a specific question, check as many boxes as appropriate.

4. Answer all questions; if a particular question or item does not apply to your program, write 'not applicable' in space provided.

5. Take advantage of the 'comment' sections. The more information you provide, the more school districts will know about your program — and the more likely they will be to call on you for help.

6. If you have any questions, don't hesitate to call me:

   Jack Taylor — (408) 625-1347

A NATIONAL SURVEY FOR CALIFORNIA OF MODEL PROGRAMS
SERVING HANDICAPPED INFANTS AND PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

Dr. Jack Taylor, Project Director
Human Resources Research Organization
27857 Berwick Drive
Carmel, California 93923

Name of Person completing this form:_____ Date:_____

Title:_____

Demographic and General Information

1. Agency Name:_____
   Address:_____
   _____ Phone:_____
   (Zip) (A/C)

2. Type of Agency:
   - ☐ Public school
   - ☐ Private school
   - ☐ Public agency (i.e., Dept. of Rehabilitation)
   - ☐ Private agency (i.e., Assoc. of Retarded Citizens)
   - ☐ Other_____

3. Contact Person or Program Director/Supervisor:_____

4. Name of Program or Project:_____

5. Length of Time Program has been operational:_____

6. Source of original program funding: ☐ Federal ☐ Local ☐ State ☐ Combination:_____ specify

7. Source of current funding:_____

8. Locate served: ☐ Urban ☐ Rural ☐ Suburban ☐ Rural/remote

9. Approximate size of geographical area served (sq. miles):_____

10. Approximate population of largest town or city in service area:_____

Population served/Child characteristics

1. Age range of children served:_____

2. Number of children currently being served:_____

3. Primary characteristics of children served by your program:
   - ☐ Learning Handicapped (learning disabilities, behavioral disorders, educationally retarded)
   - ☐ Physically Handicapped (blind, partially seeing, orthopedically handicapped, drug dependent minors, other health impaired)
   - ☐ Communicatively Handicapped (deaf, deaf-blind, severely hard of hearing, severe language handicapped incl. aphasic, language, speech)
   - ☐ Severely Handicapped (developmentally disabled, trainable mentally retarded, autistic, seriously emotionally disturbed)
   - ☐ Other:_____

4. Criteria for acceptance into program:_____
   _____
   _____

*These are the categories defined by California state law. If you prefer, check 'other' and fill in the blank using your system of classification.

Program Philosophy and Model

1. Principles on which your program is based. (List up to five in brief form.)

2. Circle the number on the following continuum which best describes your program.

Comments: _____

_____

3. The model your program most closely follows is:

☐ cognitive ☐ developmental
☐ behavioral ☐ medical
other _____

Comments: _____

_____

4. Type of child records maintained by teaching staff:

☐ anecdotal ☐ checklists
☐ charts/graphs ☐ other _____

Comments: _____

_____

Program Description

In the space provided, write a brief abstract of your program or project.

Delivery of Services

1. The program provided to the children is:

☐ Home based Frequency of usual home visit: daily___ once/week___other___
Length of usual visit: less than 1 hour ____ 1+hours____other___

☐ Center/classroom based 0-3 hours ___days/week
3-6 hours ___days/week
Other _____

☐ Combination - home and center based. Days in classroom/week_____
Hours in home visit/week_____

Comments: _____

_____

2. How are infants and preschool children transported to your program?
   - ☐ Children are not transported.
   - ☐ Parents bring child in and are reimbursed.
   - ☐ Program provides bus/van/taxi.
   - ☐ Parents transport without reimbursement.
   - ☐ Other _____

   Comments: _____

3. What community resources are utilized to carry out the program?
   - ☐ Diagnostic facility.
   - ☐ Medical facility
   - ☐ Social Service agency
   - ☐ Other _____

   Comments: _____

4. Type of staff utilized by your infant/early childhood program:
   - ☐ Master teacher/program coordinator
   - ☐ Teachers: Total number _____
     - ☐ certified in early childhood
     - ☐ certified in special education
     - ☐ certified in other categories - specify: _____
   - ☐ Paraprofessionals Total number____
   - ☐ Parents and/or volunteers Total number____
   - ☐ Speech and language clinicians Total number____
   - ☐ Occupational and/or physical therapists Total number____
   - ☐ Psychologists Total number____
   - ☐ Other: specify and give number _____

   Comments: _____

5. Frequency of staff meetings: _____

   Comments: _____

6. Frequency of inservice training for staff development _____

   Comments: _____

Program Placement

1. Percentage of instructional time handicapped children generally spend with less handicapped or normal children _____

   Comments: _____

2. Which of the following placement options are provided by your program?
   - ☐ Self-contained classroom (all children are handicapped).
   - ☐ Integrated classroom (handicapped and non-handicapped).
   - ☐ Home based.
   - ☐ Combination home and self-contained classroom.
   - ☐ Combination home and integrated classroom.
   - ☐ Other _____

   Comments: _____

Assessment and Instruction

1. List the norm and/or criterion referenced test(s) commonly used for assessment.

   _____
   _____
   _____

   Comments: _____
   _____

2. List informal assessment procedures commonly used _____
   _____
   _____

3. How frequently are children formally assessed? _____

4. Is special equipment and/or materials required to carry out your program?
   - ☐ No
   - ☐ Yes List: _____
     _____

5. Approximately what percentage of instructional time is spent on one-to-one instruction? _____ Comments: _____
   _____

6. Which developmental areas are included in your instructional program?
   - ☐ Cognitive/preacademic/academic
   - ☐ Socialization
   - ☐ Self-help
   - ☐ Gross motor
   - ☐ Fine motor
   - ☐ Language/speech
   - ☐ Other _____

   Comments: _____
   _____

7. Do you use published curricula as a guide in planning and implementing your instructional program?
   - ☐ No
   - ☐ Yes
     a. Name _____
        Publisher _____
        Address _____
        Cost at this date _____
     b. Name _____
        Publisher _____
        Address _____
        Cost at this date _____

   Comments: _____
   _____

Parental Participation

1. Aside from the IEP meeting, approximately what percentage of parents actively participate in the program? _____
2. Doing what kind of activities?
   - ☐ Volunteers
   - ☐ Advisory council
   - ☐ Teachers
   - ☐ Classroom aides
   - ☐ Transporters
   - ☐ Program evaluators
   - ☐ Member of planning team
   - ☐ Other _____

3. How often do staff meet with parents?

Group meetings___ Individual contact___

Comments:_____

_____

4. In the space provided, describe your parent involvement component.

Program Evaluation

1. Cost/year/child (add together total salaries, fringe benefits, transportation costs, materials, supplies, clerical, overhead and/or indirect costs and any other costs required to carry out the program annually. Divide this figure by the number of children served.)

2. Describe any learning verification or studies that have been done or are in process._____

_____

_____

3. What evidence can you supply which indicates effectiveness of your program?

_____

_____

_____

Dissemination, Training and Technical Assistance

1. Training and technical assistance provided by you to other agencies/districts:

- ☐ Program available for visitation/observation.
- ☐ Workshops/training at your site.
- ☐ Workshops/training at adopting sites.
- ☐ Follow-up visits to adopting sites.
- ☐ Program monitoring at adoption sites.
- ☐ Phone and/or mail consultation.
- ☐ Other_____

2. Are there established criteria or requirements for agencies wishing to adopt your program model?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes Criteria:_____

_____

_____

3. List costs involved for the adopting agency/district: i.e., travel costs for your staff to conduct training elsewhere, purchase of specific curricula, assessment instruments, etc.

Activity	Cost
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Comments:_____

_____

_____

4. Other significant program features such as parent support groups, parent library, assistance in mainstreaming, etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Has your program/project been replicated or adopted by other agencies/districts?

☐ No ☐ Yes How many? 2

Type of Locales: ☐ Urban ☐ Rural ☐ Suburban ☐ Rural/remote

6. If applicable, give requested information on at least 3 agencies/districts which have adopted your program.

Contact person: _____ Contact person: _____

Name of agency: _____ Name of agency: _____

Address: _____ Address: _____

_____ _____

Telephone: _____ Telephone: _____
A/C A/C

Contact person: _____

Name of agency: _____

Address: _____

_____

Telephone: _____
A/C

7. Materials developed by your program

Child use instructional materials

Description _____

_____

_____

_____ Cost: _____

Forms

Description: _____

_____

_____

_____ Cost: _____

Teacher training materials

Description _____

_____

_____

_____ Cost: _____

Brochures

Description: _____

_____

_____

_____ Cost: _____

Other

Description: _____

_____

_____

_____ Cost: _____

8. For further information contact:

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Telephone: _____
A/C

RB-MTRD(CA) 80-11

SUMMARY INFORMATION DESCRIBING MODEL CALIFORNIA PROGRAMS SERVING HANDICAPPED INFANTS AND PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

A Product of

A SURVEY FOR CALIFORNIA OF MODEL PROGRAMS SERVING HANDICAPPED INFANTS AND PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

John E. Taylor
Project Director

Prepared Under Grant No. 27-8160-80-3293-7100
California State Department of Education

Western Division
Human Resources Research Organization
300 N. Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

July 1980

ABSTRACT

During the past decade there has been a significant increase in the number of programs serving handicapped infants and preschool children. Information concerning these programs is needed by state and local educators in the selection of models consistent with local needs and state requirements. Information on existing models has been difficult to access and has not been readily available. As the California Master Plan for Special Education is phased in throughout the state, it is important that educators have this information so that they can select the most appropriate models or model components for local implementation.

The purpose of this study was to gather information identifying and describing model infant and preschool programs for the handicapped. The information obtained was assembled for use by education decision makers to assist them in selecting model programs or program components for adoption/adaptation by local education agencies, i.e., programs that comply with regulations and have the potential to meet the needs of local education agencies.

Two products resulted from this project:

- Selected Programs Serving Handicapped Infants and Preschool Children: A Compendium of Program Descriptions for California Educators

  This document is a compendium of individual program descriptions presenting the salient characteristics of model programs in and outside California, in both the public and private sectors.

- Summary Information Describing Model California Programs Serving Handicapped Infants and Preschool Children

  This document is a matrix of summary quantitative information on model programs in California operating in the public and private sectors.

Relevant program information was gathered through the use of a mailed survey questionnaire. Project staff developed the format and data items in collaboration with the California Department of Education, Office of Special Education (OSE), the California First Chance Consortium, and the California Regional Resource Center.

The targeted programs included all JDRP-validated First Chance projects funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH); all BEH funded Outreach projects; all Master Plan agencies in California; all innovative and preschool incentive grant programs in California; exemplary Head Start programs serving the handicapped in California and throughout the country; and other model programs in the public and private sectors. Only partial success was achieved in surveying Head Start programs.

Information was received from 142 programs (102 from in-state and 40 from out-of-state). The data were collated and analyzed to prepare the program descriptions and summary matrix. Descriptions were written for all 142 programs and assembled to form the compendium. All quantifiable information describing program characteristics of the 102 in-state programs was assembled to form the summary matrix.

Distribution of the matrix to state and local educators will provide them with a summary of the salient characteristics of the public and private

programs that are now operating within the state. Distribution of the compendium of program descriptions will provide them with the detailed program-specific information they need to select the most appropriate early-intervention model for adoption/adaptation, consistent with federal and state law, specific to local needs, and available resources.

SUMMARY INFORMATION DESCRIBING MODEL CALIFORNIA PROGRAMS SERVING HANDICAPPED INFANTS AND PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

The information presented here summarizes the data provided by representatives of 101 California programs that participated in a survey of model programs serving the preschool handicapped. The information is arranged in a matrix which presents data on a series of Program Characteristics across four Categories of Program: Public Agencies, N = 37; Public Schools, N = 34; Private Agencies, N = 19; and Private Schools, N = 12; and which combines all programs, N = 102.

In most instances, the entry in a given cell of the matrix reflects the number of programs in each category which include that particular program characteristic. In those instances where the entries reflect an average, that fact has been indicated.

Program Characteristics	Public Agencies (37)	Public Schools (34)	Private Agencies (19)	Private Schools (12)	All Combined (102)
GENERAL INFORMATION					
Average No. Years in Operation	6	5	9	9	7
Location Served:					
Suburban	22	18	13	10	63
Urban	18	17	13	10	58
Rural	22	3	6	3	34
Rural/remote	5	0	1	0	6
CHILD POPULATION SERVED					
Age Ranges:					
3-5	18	27	5	4	54
0-5	13	3	7	4	27
0-3	6	4	5	2	17
5+	6	0	4	5	15
Handicapping Conditions Served:					
Severely handicapped	25	11	17	9	62
Communicatively hand.	20	23	11	8	62
Learning handicapped	15	12	13	6	46
Physically handicapped	17	12	12	4	45
High risk	5	2	3	1	11
Multiple handicaps	3	2	2	1	8
Average No. Children Now Being Served	34	33	31	33	33
INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT					
Instructional Models:					
Developmental	34	26	16	9	85
Cognitive	12	15	4	6	37
Behavioral	11	7	3	5	26
Medical	3	0	1	0	4

Program Characteristics	Public Agencies	Public Schools	Private Agencies	Private Schools	All Combined
Developmental Areas Included:					
Language/Speech	35	29	18	12	94
Fine motor	34	27	18	12	91
Self-help	35	26	17	12	90
Socialization	33	28	17	12	90
Gross motor	33	26	18	12	89
Cognitive/Academic	34	27	16	11	88
Sensory-Motor	3	0	5	3	11
Published Curricula:					
Using	26	13	6	6	51
Not using	10	15	12	6	43
Special Equipment:					
Using	26	18	16	10	70
Not using	11	11	2	2	26
Time Spent in One-on-One Instruction:					
Up to 50%	20	20	8	6	54
51-100%	12	8	8	4	32
None	1	1	1	1	4
Frequency of Formal Assessment:					
2-4 times per year	14	12	14	6	46
Once a year	11	12	3	3	29
Entry-exit	7	6	2	0	15
As needed	1	2	1	3	7
Less than once per year	4	0	0	1	5
Child Records Maintained:					
Anecdotal	27	25	15	10	77
Checklists	22	23	11	8	64
Charts/Graphs	19	16	11	6	52
Other data	17	15	8	6	46
SERVICE DELIVERY					
Center/Classroom Based	29	23	14	10	76
Average No. classes/week (up to 3 hrs.)	5	4	2	5	4
Average No. classes/week (3 to 6 hrs.)	5	5	5	5	5
Comb. Center/Classroom with Home Based	11	9	7	3	30
Average No. classroom days per week	3	3	2	3	3
Average No. home hours per week	1	2	1	2	2

Program Characteristics	Public Agencies	Public Schools	Private Agencies	Private Schools	All Combined
Home Based	9	0	5	1	15
Average No. home visits per week	2	0	1	2	2
Average No. hours per visit	1	0	1	1	1
Transportation to Program:					
Bused by program	30	23	7	4	64
Parents transport	14	13	18	14	59
Not transported	2	1	1	0	4
Community Resources Used:					
Medical facility	18	18	12	4	52
Diagnostic facility	15	19	10	6	50
Social service agency	15	18	11	5	49
CCS and/or Regional Cntr.	17	7	7	4	35
Other	8	8	3	4	23
EMPLOYMENT OF STAFF					
Master Teacher/Program Coordinator	25	23	10	12	70
Average No. teachers on staff	4	2	3	7	4
Certification:					
Special education	26	22	8	9	65
Early childhood	10	9	10	6	35
Speech/Language	7	7	0	2	16
Elementary education	0	3	3	3	9
Non-Teaching Staffs:					
Paraprofessionals	31	30	6	11	78
Speech & Lang. clinicians	29	24	13	10	76
Psychologists	27	31	10	6	74
Parents or Volunteers	18	16	14	10	58
Occup./Phys. therapists	20	15	13	8	56
Nurses	10	10	4	2	26
PE specialists	3	3	0	1	7
Student tutors	2	3	1	0	6
Others	15	4	12	8	39
Frequency of Staff Meetings:					
Weekly	28	23	13	11	65
Daily	4	6	5	0	15
Monthly	7	4	0	1	12
Bi-weekly	8	1	1	0	10

Program Characteristics	Public Agencies	Public Schools	Private Agencies	Private Schools	All Combined
Frequency of Inservice Training:					
Monthly	18	11	7	6	42
2-4 times per year	10	8	3	3	24
Weekly	4	7	4	4	19
PROGRAM PLACEMENT					
Time Spent in Mainsteaming:					
None	11	12	10	3	36
Up to 50%	13	13	5	5	36
51-100%	8	9	2	4	23
Placement Options:					
Self-Cont. classroom	25	23	9	9	66
Integrated classroom	14	15	2	6	37
Comb. Home & Self-Cont.	11	6	4	2	23
Home Based	12	4	4	2	22
Comb. Home & Integrated	5	5	5	3	18
Other	1	3	3	0	7
PARENTAL PARTICIPATION					
Average Percentage of Parents Active	57	62	66	71	63
Parent Activities:					
Volunteers	24	20	7	10	61
Planning team members	17	14	9	5	45
Advisory council members	16	9	8	7	40
Classroom aides	12	10	6	5	33
Transporters	6	11	8	6	31
Parent meetings	9	5	4	3	21
Program evaluators	9	2	3	3	17
Teachers	7	3	5	2	17
Home programs	6	6	3	0	15
Observers	2	5	0	0	7
Other	7	0	3	3	13
Frequency of Staff-Parent Group Meetings:					
Monthly	15	6	6	3	30
Several per year	7	7	3	4	21
Weekly	7	4	4	4	19

Program Characteristics	Public Agencies	Public Schools	Private Agencies	Private Schools	All Combined
Frequency of Staff-Parent Indiv. Meetings					
Daily	4	6	4	4	18
Monthly	11	3	1	2	17
Several per week	7	5	4	1	17
Weekly	5	3	3	3	14
Several per year	2	2	3	3	10
DISSEMINATION, TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE					
Assistance Provided:					
Visitation/Observation of program	31	24	18	12	85
Phone/Mail consultation	25	17	14	9	65
Workshops at program site	21	11	11	8	51
Workshops at adopting site	9	3	5	7	24
Follow-up visits to adopting site	6	4	4	5	19
Program monitoring at adopting site	4	1	3	5	13
Criteria/Requirements for Adopting Agencies:					
Do not have	23	27	13	7	70
Have	9	0	3	4	16
Program Has Been Replicated	8	8	7	6	29
Urban	3	4	3	4	14
Suburban	2	2	2	4	10
Rural	4	0	2	1	7
Rural/remote	1	0	0	0	1
Program Has Not Been Replicated	19	23	11	4	57